

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1184

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LOCKHEED MARTIN MARIETTA; CARE MARK PRESCRIPTION, c/o Lockheed Martin; SAM PERRY, Commonwealth Investigation Officer; LOCKHEED MARTIN CORPORATION,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL K. MANN; TOM PERRY; MARY SCAHULZ; JUDITH ANN STRAUSS; ROBERT VAAGE; DOUGLAS FLANKEN; CYNTHIA VAAGE; CONNECTICUT LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY; SHERMAN, MEEHANS, CURTIN; LAUREN SHEA; QUINLAN H. HANCOCK; MARK, SANDGROUND, BARONDESS & WEST; MARK SANDGROUND; MARK BARONDESS; LARRY ANDERSON,

Defendants.

No. 99-1295

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CARE MARK PRESCRIPTION, c/o Lockheed Martin;
SAM PERRY, Commonwealth Investigation Officer,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL K. MANN; LOCKHEED MARTIN MARIETTA; TOM
PETTY; MARY SCAHULZ; JUDITH ANN STRAUSS;
ROBERT VAAGE; DOUGLAS FLANKEN; CYNTHIA VAAGE;
CONNECTICUT LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY; SHERMAN,
MEEHANS, CURTIN; LAUREN SHEA; QUINLAN H.
HANCOCK; MARK, SANDGROUND, BARONDESS & WEST;
MARK SANDGROUND; MARK BARONDESS; LARRY
ANDERSON,

Defendants.

No. 99-1305

AFAF KANAZEH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CARE MARK PRESCRIPTION, c/o Lockheed Martin;
SAM PERRY, Commonwealth Investigation Officer,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL K. MANN; LOCKHEED MARTIN MARIETTA; TOM
PERRY; MARY SCAHULZ; JUDITH ANN STRAUSS;
ROBERT VAAGE; DOUGLAS FLANKEN; CYNTHIA VAAGE;
CONNECTICUT LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY; SHERMAN,
MEEHANS, CURTIN; LAUREN SHEA; QUINLAN H.
HANCOCK; MARK, SANDGROUND, BARONDESS & WEST;
MARK SANDGROUND; MARK BARONDESS; LARRY
ANDERSON,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Albert V. Bryan, Jr., Senior
District Judge. (CA-98-1410-A)

Submitted: August 10, 1999

Decided: August 31, 1999

Before ERVIN, HAMILTON, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

Nos. 99-1184 and 99-1305 dismissed in part and affirmed in part and
No. 99-1295 dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Afaf Kanazeh, Appellant Pro Se. Benjamin Sorrells Boyd, PIPER &
MARBURY, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In case No. 99-1184, Afaf Kanazeh appeals the district court's orders of November 2, 1998¹; November 13, 1998; January 22, 1999; and February 1, 1999.² We dismiss Kanazeh's appeal as to the January 22, 1999 order, insofar as the order dismisses without prejudice Kanazeh's claims against Lockheed Martin under the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA). See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). We affirm as to the remaining issues in the January 22, 1999 order and as to the remaining orders on the reasoning of the district court. See Kanazeh v. Mann, No. CA-98-1410-A (E.D. Va. Nov. 2 & 13, 1998; Jan. 22 & Feb. 1, 1999).

In case No. 99-1295, Kanazeh appeals the order of February 16, 1999. We dismiss the appeal as interlocutory because the order appealed was not a final order. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1291-1292 (1994);

¹ Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on October 30, 1998, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on November 2, 1998. It is the date the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and 79(a); Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).

² The district court's order is marked as "filed" on January 29, 1999, but the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on February 1, 1999.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 546-47 (1949).

In case No. 99-1305, Kanazeh appeals the orders of February 19, 1999; February 26, 1999; and March 26, 1999. We dismiss the appeal as to the March 26, 1999 order, insofar as it dismisses without prejudice defendants Care Mark Prescription and Sam Perry. See Domino Sugar Corp., 10 F.3d at 1066-67. We affirm as to the remaining issues in the March 26, 1999 order and as to the remaining orders on the reasoning of the district court. See Kanazeh v. Mann, No. CA-98-1410-A (E.D. Va. Feb. 19, 26, & Mar. 26, 1999).

We deny Kanazeh's "Motion for Leave to Bring In Third-Party Defendant" and "Motion to Supplement Records on Appeal and Perfection to Enforce a Judgment and Motion to Join All Cases on Pending Appeal." We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

No. 99-1184 - DISMISSED IN PART; AFFIRMED IN PART

No. 99-1295 - DISMISSED

No. 99-1305 - DISMISSED IN PART; AFFIRMED IN PART